



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,416	09/29/2003	Mohammad A. Faruque	42P17185	6184
45209 7590 06/09/2009				
INTEL/BSTZ				
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP				
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY				
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040				
EXAMINER				
DEANE JR, WILLIAM J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2614				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/09/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/675,416

Applicant(s)

FARUQUE ET AL.

Examiner

William J. Deane

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2007/0259688 (Forte) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,266,539 (Pardo).

With respect to claims 1 – 3, 9, 11 – 13, 19, 21 – 23, 27 and 29, Forte teaches a method and system where a PBX 14 receives an incoming call directed to the PBX (Paragraph 0025) , routing the call based on user preferences (Paragraphs 0021, 0033 and 0034) and routing to a computing device (Paragraph 022).

Forte discloses the instant limitations except for the docking station aspects. However, note that Pardo teaches such (see at least Figs. 10A, 10B, 11A and 11B). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated such a docking station in which once removed from the docking station the calls are switched to a preferred device as disclosed by Pardo into the Forte device, as such would only entail one PDA system for another. Note that with respect to Pardo, when the PDA is in the docking station, calls are routed to the PDA (digital) and when the PDA is not in the

docking station calls are routed to the base station, which acts as a regular telephone (analog).

With respect to claims 4, 14 and 24 note paragraphs 0021 and 0033.

With respect to claims 6 and 16, such would be inherent.

With respect to claims 7 and 17, note paragraph 0022.

With respect to claims 10 and 20, note paragraphs 0046 and 0049.

With respect to claim 26, such a limitation is inherent.

With respect to claims 8, 18, 28 and 30, an icon being displayed on a computing device for indicating an incoming call, such is notoriously old in the art and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided such wherever it was deemed necessary.

With respect to claim 30 and the limitation of a headset, such is also notoriously old in the art and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a headset whenever it was deemed necessary.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 - 30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bill Deane whose telephone number is (571) 272-7484. In addition, facsimile transmissions should be directed to Bill Deane at facsimile number (571) 273-8300.

07Jun2009

/William J Deane/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614